REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. An RCE accompanies this Amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 15-17 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 15-17 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 7, and 10 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323 to McCanne et al. ("McCanne") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,088 to Yamano ("Yamano"), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,939 to Kraft ("Kraft") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,820,133 to Grove et al. ("Grove").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind McCanne.

Amended claim 1 includes:

A method, comprising:

> receiving a first request for an information object at an anycast address of a network, wherein the request is received at an information object repository selected according to specified performance metrics by communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol by the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP);

resolving the anycast address to a corresponding unicast network address for the information object, wherein the resolving includes transmitting a second request for the corresponding unicast network address in response to the first request, awaiting an anycast resolution response to the second request for a predetermined time, and returning a failure message if the response to the second request is not received within the predetermined time, wherein the second request is a single IP packet having the anycast network address;

instructing the information object repository to obtain a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast network address; and

returning the corresponding unicast network address, if the anycast resolution response in response to the second request is received within the predetermined time, the anycast resolution response is a single IP packet having the corresponding unicast network address.

(emphasis added)

Applicants submit that the amendments are supported by the specification (e.g., paragraphs [0054], [0056], [0064], [0065], and [0068]).

McCanne discloses the following:

> The ARN selects a candidate service node S from its associated service cluster. The selection decision may be based on load and availability information that is maintained from a local monitoring protocol...

(McCanne, col. 16, lines 13-17)(emphasis added)

In particular, McCanne discloses:

> ... each ARN maintains an information database containing load information about some number of eligible service nodes. The ARN consults its information database to determine the most available service node for each client request. To maintain its load information, an ARN can actively probe network paths and service nodes. Alternatively, service nodes can monitor network load and internal load, and report load information to their respective ARNs.

(McCanne, col. 17, lines 45-58)(emphasis added)

Thus, McCanne discloses reporting the load information. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network. McCanne fails

to disclose communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), as recited in amended claim 1.

Yamano, in contrast, discloses a node configuration setup system. Yamano fails to disclose communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), as recited in amended claim 1.

Kraft, in contrast, discloses the user-initiated maintenance of document locators. Kraft fails to disclose communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), as recited in amended claim 1.

Grove, in contrast, discloses communicating the requests using the high-performance protocol. Grove fails to disclose communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication

protocol between the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Kraft, Yamano, Grove, and McCann were combined, such a combination would still lack communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between routers of the network by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers that runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, Kraft and Grove.

Given that claims 2, 6-12, 15 and 16 contain limitations that are either the same or similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 6-12, 15 and 16 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, in view of Yamano, in further view of Kraft and in further view of Grove.

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne, Yamano, Kraft and Grove, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,872 to McCanne ("McCanne.2").

McCanne. 2, in contrast, a multicast communication. McCanne. 2 fails to disclose communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between the routers by executing a Web Information

Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers, as recited in amended claim 10.

Furthermore, even if McCanne.2, Kraft , Yamano, Grove, and McCanne were combined, such a combination would still lack communicating mappings of an address of a client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client between the routers by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance (WILD) communication protocol between the routers, as recited in amended claim 10.

Given that claim 17 depends from amended claim 10, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over McCanne, Yamano, Kraft, Grove, and further in view of McCanne.2.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 13, 2009

/Tatiana Rossin/
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax No. (408) 720-8383

Customer No. 008791